

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, 14, and 16-18 are presented for further examination. Claims 8, 13, and 15 have been canceled, and claims 1, 7, 9, 14, and 16 have been amended.

In the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, the Examiner allowed claims 1, 3, 4, and 6, and found claims 8-9 to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claims 7, 10, and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Heinrich et al. (of record) in view of Barnes, Jr. (Publication No. 2003/0220835) and further in view of Hattori (Publication No. 2003/0063910).

Applicants respectfully request reexamination and further consideration of the claims.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 9, 14, and 16 to place all of the claims in condition for allowance, as discussed in more detail below.

Claim 1, although allowed by the Examiner, contained a minor typographical error in line 14 that required deletion of the word “circuit.” No new matter has been added and the scope of claim 1 has not been changed. Rather, there was no antecedent basis for “microprocessor circuit.” By deleting “circuit,” the recitation of the “microprocessor” finds its antecedent in the prior recitation of a “low-power CMOS microprocessor.”

Claim 7 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable dependent claim 8. Thus, claim 7 is now allowable dependent claim rewritten into independent form. In view of the allowability of dependent claim 8, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 and remaining dependent claims 9, 10, and 12 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 13 has been canceled.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to include the recitation of the low-power CMOS microprocessor coupled to the receiving means to provide the extracted power to the at least one external device, and to further include the recitation of the at least one input pin comprising at least one input-and-output pin and wherein the microprocessor is configured to generate an output on the at least one input-and-output pin in response to the received radio-frequency signals, the microprocessor adapted to process both analog and digital signals.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is now allowable for the reasons why claim 1 is allowable.

Dependent claims 16-18 are allowable for the reasons why claim 14 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jk

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031